

### **REMARKS**

By this Amendment, claims 1 and 6 are amended. Reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-3 and 5-8 is respectfully requested.

The final Office Action dated March 19, 2007 and the Advisory Action of July 6, 2007 rejects claims 1-3 and 5-8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,076,168 to Fiveash et al. ("Fiveash") in view of one or more of U.S. Patent No. 5,937,159 to Meyers et al. ("Meyers"); U.S. Patent No. 5,983,350 to Minear et al. ("Minear"), non-patent document S. Kent, BBN corp.; "Security Architecture for the Internet Protocol, Request for Comments: 2401," November 1998 ("RFC 2401"); and non-patent document S. Kent, BBN corp., "IP Encapsulating Security payload (ESP), Request for Comments: 2406," November 1998 ("RFC 2406"). Based upon the amendments to claims 1 and 6, these rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent claims 1 and 6 are amended to recite, *inter alia*, wherein a trusted channel encrypts a packet to be transmitted through a network "without user manipulation based upon the MAC security class," (emphasis added). By applying a trusted channel to the packet, the encrypted data, including the MAC, is protected from exposure even in the event that the packet is intercepted while being transmitted. Applicants respectfully submit that the applied art fails to disclose, teach, or suggest at least this feature of the amended claims that encrypts a packet without user manipulation based upon the MAC security class.

For example, unlike the Applicants' method and apparatus, the IPsec protocol, as disclosed in RFC2401 and RFC2406, employs user manipulation in the configuration of a trusted channel. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that unlike the apparatus and method recited in claims 1 and 6, nowhere does the applied references disclose wherein a MAC is communicated using IPsec.

Accordingly, since none of the applied art discloses, teaches or suggests each and every feature recited in amended independent claims 1 and 6, the rejection of claims 1 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is improper.

Applicants respectfully submit, therefore, that independent claims 1 and 6 are patentable over the applied art, either alone or in permissible combinations. Claims 2-3, 5, and 7-8 are

likewise patentable over the applied art at least based on their dependency on an allowable base claim, as well as for additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection over the applied art is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance and favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-3 and 5-8 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 07-1337 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,  
LOWE HAUPTMAN HAM & BERNER, LLP

/Yoon S Ham/  
Yoon S. Ham  
Registration No. 45,307

Customer Number: 22429  
1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 300  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314  
(703) 684-1111  
(703) 518-5499 Facsimile  
Date: September 18, 2007